IN THE UNITED STATES DESTRECT COURT

Robert W. Hassett, III.
Petitioner

V,

1 Civ. Act. No. 05-609-JJE

Richard Kearney, warden, and June Brady, Attorney General For the state of Delaware, respondent.



Motion to Dismiss

Pursuant to the Federal Rules of civil Procedure, petitioner moves for a dismissal of respondents motion for an extension of time to file an answering brief, to petitioners opening brief. In support, the petitioners states the following:

i) The respondents were notified

and giving copies of petitioners habeas corpus in a timely manner to reply.

I The court ordered a 45 day time limit to prepare and file an absorver to the petition. Giving that the respondents already knew of the petition and it's facts. That was ample enough time to file. As it stands, respondents have until November 28, 2005, to file.

a respondents work load is not a sufficient reason for delay or for an extension of time request; Nor does a respondents holiday vacation count as a grievest or extreme reason to warrant an extension of time, as the time set by the courts include this.

4) Although it is stated in Maseas
Rule 4, that the court has the
discretion to give respondents an extension
of time exceeding the 40-clay limit
in civil Rule 81 (a) (a). It is not
to be asused by the respondents
to fit their work ethics or

personal life interests. The Haseas Rules were formed to protect the legality of rights provided under the Us. constitution. And according to the Haseas rules and the U.S. constitution; the reasons for an extension of time must be extreme in nature or apply to the case in guestion; e.g. materials are in a position that is not obtainable without this extension.

5) Although this is the respondents
first request for an extension of time.
The is improper and misguided in nature
as to the Federal Rules of civil Procedure.

(b) Petitioner submits that respondents
motion for extension of time, be dismissed
and order be set that respondents
answering brief is still due by Nov.
28, 2005. Petitioner submits herewith
a proposed order.

Dade Nov, 21, 2005

120 Sex + W. Hasself III. 5BX 537363 Pro-se Pro-se

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

Robert W. Hassett, III, Petitioner

V.

civ. Act. No. 05-609-JJF

Richard Kearney,
warden, and NI, Jane Brady,
Attorney General, for the 1
state of Delaware,
respondent,

ORDER

This day of _______,2005.

whereas, petitioner having requested a dismissal of respondents metion for extension of time to file an answer, and whereas, appearing to the court that the request for dismissal is timely, (in accordance to recieving respondents

motion for an extension of time, and has been in accordance with Federal Rules of civil Proceedure. As well as having shown good cause for dissmissal.

It is hereby ordered that the respondents request for extension of time is derived, and answer shall be filed on or before November 28, 2005, as previously ordered.

UNITED States District Judge

Rule 7,1.1 CERTIFICATION

I, here by certify that I have neither sought nor obtained the consent of the respondents, who is the worder, and afterney General, to the subject matter of this notion.

Date: Nov. 21,2005

Robert W. Hasself Petitioner Pro-se.

Certificate of Service

Z, hereby certify that on Nov. 21, 2005; I mailed in the U.S. postage service at s.C.Z. prison, a motion for dismissal of motion for extension of time for respondents to file an answer. I have mailed by U.S. service two copies of the same documents to the following:

Elizabeth R. McFarlan Deputy Attorney General Department of Justice 820 N. French Street. Wilmington, Rel. 19801

> Robert W. Hasself II SBX 337363 Pro-Se Pro-

19947 I/M: 1205gct Messoft bidg: 775g-25C, sussex correctional institution 7938 GEORGETOWN, DELAWARE 19947 P.O. BOX 500